**To:** Engelking, Pat (MPCA)[pat.engelking@state.mn.us]

# Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

**From:** Leonard Anderson
**Sent:** Fri 7/17/2015 12:35:04 AM
**Subject:** Re: Additional feedback on July 14 meeting from Advisory Committee members

I completely understand why the sulfate polluters of the state would lobby the MPCA to use EC 20 or even EC 50 as opposed to EC 10 or EC 5. However, the unbiased peer reviewers of the wild rice sulfate research suggest a more protective approach. As a hand harvester and waterfowl-er since 1954, I have

an opinion too. I support EC 5 as being truly protective of wild rice. We need to remember the advice of the peer reviewers. In Sect 3.1 of the Summary Report of the Peer Review Meeting we read, "Reviewers agreed that it would be useful for the hydroponics study to consider wild rice populations dynamics when determining effects concentrations. Two reviewers commented that the MPCA's use of EC 20 and EC 50 is not necessarily protective of wild rice. Compounded annually, the effects of EC 20 exposure levels could be anticipated to cause a dramatic decline in wild rice populations over several years." We don't need any more "dramatic declines" in wild rice populations.

Thank you. Len Anderson

--- pat.engelking@state.mn.us wrote:

From: "Engelking, Pat (MPCA)" <pat.engelking@state.mn.us>

**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Subject: Additional feedback on July 14 meeting from Advisory Committee members
Date: Thu, 16 Jul 2015 14:14:14 +0000

Hello,

Please see the attached e-mails for questions/comments we have received from Advisory Committee members as follow up to Tuesday's advisory committee meeting in Duluth.

Pat

Patricia Engelking

Environmental Analysis and Outcomes

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

651-757-2340

pat.engelking@state.mn.us